

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Khemahem et al. (U.S. 6,702,613). Claims 2-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Abstract of the Disclosure

Applicant is submitting a substitute Abstract of the Disclosure for that originally filed with this application to more clearly describe the claimed invention. Entry of the substitute Abstract of the Disclosure is respectfully requested.

Drawings

In the outstanding Office Action, the Office Action Summary (Form PTOL-325) was marked indicating that the drawings filed on December 31, 2003 were objected to by the Examiner, but no explanation was provided for the objection. Mr. Gary F. Paumen, the Examiner, was contacted regarding the objection to the drawings and he confirmed that the objection was in error and that the objection would be corrected in the next papers from the Examiner.

Amendments to Specification

Applicant has amended the specification as noted above to cure obvious grammatical and idiomatic inaccuracies. It is believed that the foregoing amendments to the specification overcome the outstanding objections thereto. No "new matter" has been added to the original disclosure by the foregoing amendments to the specification.

New Claims

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 1-9 and has added new claims 10-17 to this application. It is believed that the new claims 10-17 are commensurate in scope with original claims 2-9, with claims 2, 3, and 5 containing the subject matter of original claim 1. It is believed that the new claims specifically

set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 2-9 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Applicant's new claim 10 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 2, thus redrafting claim 2 in independent form. Applicant's new claims 12, 14, 16 and 17, which are commensurate in scope with the original claims 4, 6, 8 and 9, all depend from new claim 10. Applicant's new claim 11 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 3, thus redrafting claim 3 in independent form. Applicant's new claim 15, which is commensurate in scope with original claim 7, depends from new claim 11. New claim 13 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 5, thus redrafting claim 5 in independent form. In the absence of any art cited against Applicant's original claims 2, 3, or 5, it is not believed that any detailed discussion of the cited prior art reference is necessary. Suffice to say that all of the claims remaining in this patent application contain subject matter against which no prior art citations have been made.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 11, 2005

By:


Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707